



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,181	04/14/2000	Trung Minh Tran	AUS000078US1	9402

7590 11/20/2003

Duke W Yee
Carsteris YEE & Cahoon LLP
P O Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

WANG, LIANG CHE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/550,181

Applicant(s)

TRAN, TRUNG MINH

Examiner

Liang-che Alex Wang

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-19 and 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-19 and 21-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11, 13-19, 21-40 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 9, 11, 13-18, 21-27, 29-33, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsen et al., US Patent Number 6,088,700, hereinafter Larsen.

4. Referring to claim 1, Larsen has taught a method for maintaining state information for web page (see title and abstract), comprising:

receiving user input to a Web page via a Web browser at a client device (abstract lines 3-4, fill out data field ... multiple forms ... on the web browser of users... Col 2 lines 8-13, 30-33, Col 3 lines 28-30, Col 17 lines 14-16, the user input is used for future automatically form filling on the web page via a browser of users);

sending an instruction to store user input and a Web identifier in a directory server (abstract lines 7-9, "the data process system retrieves tagged information previously entered and stored in the database"; abstract line 9, " sending instruction for storing is inherent since computer processing requires instruction to complete tasks, therefore the step of sending an instruction must be in Larsen in order to process the storing step;)

storing the user input and a corresponding web page field identifier (abstract, Col 17 lines 25-45) in the directory server (Col 3 lines 12-14, database of Larsen is a directory server); and

in response to receiving a user request, via the Web browser, for the Web page, sending a request to the directory server to retrieve the user input and corresponding Web page identifier (Col 3 line 59 – Col 4 line 8, Abstract line 7-13), wherein the user input and corresponding Web page field identifier are retrieved from the directory server (abstract, Col 2 lines 8-11, 20-38.)

Although Larsen has not explicitly taught using a background application at the client device to send instruction and retrieve the user input. But, Larsen does teach the data processing system retrieves previously saved information and automatically inserts the data in a variety of forms (abstract lines 7-13.) It is known that every processing system has instruction being processed in order to perform functions. And the instructions are viewed as background application since they are both just groups of computer codes that perform particular tasks. Without this background application, a processing system will not function, therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Larsen such that to implemented his invention by using a background application.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Larsen because background application is well known in the art as computer codes that runs the processing system, and a person with ordinary skill in the art would have implemented Larsen's invention using various of well known type of

application including plug-in and background applications to enhance the functionalities of Larsen's computer system.

5. Referring to claim 2, Larsen has further taught wherein the user input and Web page field identifier are common to a plurality of Web pages (Col 17 lines 25-29.)
6. Referring to claim 3, Larsen has further taught wherein the user input and Web page field identifier are common to a plurality of Web pages (Col 17 lines 34-38.)
7. Referring to claim 4, Larsen has further taught the method of claim 1, further comprising:
matching the Web page field identifier to an entry field identifier located in the Web page (Col 17 lines 46-56); and inserting the user input into a field associated with the entry field identifier (abstract lines 7-11.)
8. Referring to claim 5, Larsen has further taught the method of claim 1, further comprising:
receiving a Web page retrieval request having a web page identifier identifying the Web page from a Web browser running on the client device (Col 2 lines 35-38, Col 3 lines 2-4, 61-64); and
sending the Web page identifier to the directory server from the background application running on the client device (Col 3 lines 64-67); and
receiving the user input and Web page field identifier from the directory server in response to sending the Web page identifier from the background application running on the client device (Col 4 lines 3-25);
9. Referring to claim 6, Larsen has further taught the method of claim 5, further comprising inserting the user input into a field of the web page corresponding to the Web page field identifier (abstract line 1-7.)

10. Referring to claim 7, Larsen has further taught wherein the user input and the Web page field identifier are stored in a Web page entry of the directory server identified by a user identifier and a Web page identifier (see table provided from Col 5-15, client_id is considered as user identifier, and tag_id, form_id are all sort of a Web page identifier, however the function of the claim is taught by Larsen where a Web page identifier is being stored in an entry (the table) in the directory server (database), which is identified by user ID and webpage ID.)
11. Referring to claim 9, Larsen has further taught wherein the Web page field identifier is a HyperText Mark-up Language tag (Col 18 lines 42-44.)
12. Referring to claim 11, Larsen has further taught wherein the method is implemented using a plug-in application to a Web browser (Col 4 lines 1-20, PDF format files is being used by Larson in his invention, therefore an plug-in application (Adobe Reader) is being used to implemented the invention.)
13. Referring to claims 13-18, claims 13-18 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-6. Therefore, claims 13-18 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-6.
14. Referring to claims 21-27, claims 21-27 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-7. Therefore, claims 21-27 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-7.
15. Referring to claims 29-33, and 35, claims 29-33 and 35 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-7, and 9. Therefore, claims 29-33 and 35 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-7, and 9.

16. Referring to claims 21-27, claims 21-27 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-7. Therefore, claims 21-27 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-7.

17. Referring to claims 36-40, claims 36-40 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1, 5, 6. Therefore, claims 36-40 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1, 5, 6.

18. Claims 8, 19, 28, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsen in views of Tomko, US Patent Number 5,790,668, hereinafter Tomko.

19. Referring to claim 8, Larsen has taught where in the user input is stored in the directory server (see previous paragraphs.)

Larsen has not explicitly taught the user input is encrypted before being stored.

However, Tomko has taught the input data is encrypted before being stored at the selected address (Col 7 lines 53-55.)

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Larsen such that to have the user input encrypted before being stored

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Larsen because having the input being encrypted would provide the security to the input (see title of Tomko.)

20. Referring to claims 19, 28, 34, claims 19, 28, 34 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 8. Therefore, claims 19, 28, 34 are rejected for the same reason as the claim 8.

21. Claims 10 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsen in views of Call, US Patent Number 6,154,738, hereinafter Call.

22. Referring to claim 10, Larsen has not taught the directory server in claim 1, however, Larsen has not explicitly taught wherein the directory server is an LDAP server.

However, Call has taught that a LDAP server maybe advantageously employed to store "entries".... (Col 20 lines 27-Col 21 lines 4; which show that LDAP server could be also viewed as a directory server.)

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Larsen such that to have the directory server to be the LDAP server, because LDAP server is already well known in the art to be a directory server as being developed at the University of Michigan and later further developed by Netscape Communication Corp. provides both access and update capabilities. (Col 20 lines 30-34.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Larsen because LDAP is not a newly invented server, which is already known in the art.

23. Referring to claim 36, claim 36 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 10. Therefore, claims 36 are rejected for the same reason as the claim 10.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/2003, paper number 5, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

25. In that remarks, applicant's argues in substance:

- a. That: Larsen does not teach receiving user input to a Web page via a Web Browser at a client device (page 11 lines 8-9.)

This is found not persuasive because Larsen teaches a system that automatically fill out data fields of the various and multiple forms displayed on **the Web browsers of users who are engaged in commerce** by using **previously entered and stored** user inputs (abstract.) Therefore Larsen is teaching all the limitations of "receiving user input to a Web page via a Web Browser at a client device".

- b. That: Larsen does not teach sending an instruction to store user input and a Web page field identifier in a directory server from a background application running on the client device and sending a request from the background application running on the client device to the directory server to retrieve user input ... (page 11 lines 9-14;) and Larsen does not teach or suggest any background application that runs on a client device.

This is not found persuasive as indicated in the rejection to claim 1 in paragraph 4. A person with ordinary skill in the art would know that there must be a background application running on the client device in order for the client device to send the user input to be store in the remote database server, or the client device would not function.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2155

26. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
27. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).
28. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.
29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (703) 305-8159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2155

30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T Alam can be reached on (703)308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for regular communications.
31. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

Liang-che Wang
November 12th, 2003

lw

Hosain Alam

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER